



**Interim Standards of Quality and Effectiveness
for Blended Programs
of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation
for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials**

November 1998

**Interim Standards of Quality and Effectiveness
for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation
for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials**

**Handbook for Teacher Educators
And Accreditation Team Members**

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

November 1998

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

State of California

Pete Wilson, Governor

November 1998

Members of the Commission

Carolyn Ellner, Chair
Torrie L. Norton, Vice-Chair
Melodie Blowers
Verna Dauterive
Carol Katzman
Scott Harvey
Helen Lee
Doris Miner
Gary Reed
Edmund Sutro
Jane Veneman
Nancy Zarenda

Postsecondary Education Member
Teacher
School Board Member
Administrator
Office of the State Superintendent
Public Member
Public Member
School Counselor
Public Member
Teacher
Teacher
Teacher

Ex Officio Members

Edward DeRoche
Bill Wilson
Elizabeth Graybill
Jon Snyder

Association of Independent California
Colleges and Universities
California State University
California Postsecondary Education
Commission
University of California

Executive Officer

Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.

Executive Director

Committee on Accreditation

1998

Co-Chairs 1998-99

Anthony Avina
Randall Souviney

Anthony Avina

Superintendent
Whittier Union High School District

Carol Barnes

Professor, Elementary, Bilingual and Reading Education
California State University, Fullerton

Diane Cordero de Noriega

Dean, College of Education
California State University, Sacramento

Sandy Fleishman

Teacher, 5th Grade
Las Virgenes Unified School District

Irvin Howard

Professor, School of Education
California State University, San Bernardino

Barry Kaufman

Dean, School of Education
Dominican College

Kim Lindley

Director, Staff Development
Capistrano Unified School District

Bonnie Maspero

Administrator, Educational Services
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District

Susan Seamans

Coordinator, BTSA Program
Tehama County Office of Education

Randall Souviney

Co-Director, Teacher Education Program
University of California, San Diego

Catherine Sumpter

Principal, Bret Harte Middle School
Los Angeles Unified School District

Sue Teele

Director, Education Extension
University of California, Riverside

Committee Staff:

Dennis S. Tierney, Director of Professional Services
Lawrence W. Birch, Administrator of Accreditation
Philip A. Fitch, Consultant
Shari Cooley, Secretary

Advisory Task Force on Interim Standards for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation 1998

Jacques Benninga	Chair, Literacy and Early Development California State University, Fresno
Mark Cary	Teacher Patwin Elementary School Davis Unified School District
Bob Cichowski	Coordinator, Liberal Studies Program California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Cherie DeJong	Associate Professor Department of Curriculum and Instruction California State University, Los Angeles
Marilyn Draheim	Chair, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of the Pacific
Crystal Gips	Associate Dean, College of Education California State University, Northridge
Ed Kujawa	Director, Multiple Subjects and Special Education, University of San Diego
Bridgett Lewin	Science Instructor, Multiple Subjects Program University of California, Santa Barbara
Ann Littman	Teacher, Hollow Hills Elementary School Simi Valley Unified School District
Sheila McCoy	Professor, Department of Liberal Studies California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Iris Riggs	Associate Dean, School of Education California State University, San Bernardino
Task Force Support Staff:	David Wright , Director, Office of Policy and Programs Mary Vixie Sandy , Consultant, Professional Services

Table of Contents

Commissioners.....	iii
Committee on Accreditation.....	iv
Advisory Task Force on Interim Standards for Blended Programs Of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
Introduction to Interim Standards for Blended Programs	1
What is a Blended Program?.....	2
Who Must Respond to the Interim Standards for Blended Programs?.....	2
What Must be Submitted in Response to the Interim Standards?	3
Accelerated Approval of Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation.....	4
Eligibility of Institutions for Accelerated Approval	4
Conditions to be Accepted by Institutions Using This Option	4
Procedural Operation of the Accelerated Approval Option	5
Interim Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation	6
Standard 1 Concurrent Curriculum	6
Standard 2 Connected Curriculum.....	7
Standard 3 Rigorous Curriculum	9
Standard 4 Collaboration in Curriculum Development	10
Standard 5 Developmental Quality	11
Standard 6 Early Advisement	12
Standard 7 Guided Early Career Exploration.....	13
Standard 8 Intra-Institutional Collaboration	14
Standard 9 Inter-Institutional Collaboration	15
Background and Context for the Development of Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation	16
Comprehensive Review of Teaching Credential Requirements (SB 1422).....	16
Relevant Provisions of the Education Code (SB 2042, 1998)	17
New Standards for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Preparation Programs.....	19
Interim Standards for Blended Programs	20
Blended Programs, Education Majors and Education Minors.....	20

Introduction to Interim Standards for Blended Programs

From 1994-97, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing sponsored a comprehensive review of the requirements for earning and renewing Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials, pursuant to SB 1422 (1992). The review was conducted by an Advisory Panel, appointed by the Commission, that examined all facets of the current credentialing system and developed a series of recommendations aimed at improving the recruitment, preparation, induction and ongoing development of school teachers.

Among its many recommendations, the SB 1422 Advisory Panel called for the Commission to encourage colleges and universities to establish *blended programs of subject matter and professional preparation* for teaching candidates who decide early in their education that they would like to be teachers. While colleges and universities have not been prohibited from developing such programs in the past, there has been some confusion about what the law specifically allows with regard to undergraduate teacher preparation. Whereas prior law allowed colleges and universities to offer professional preparation to undergraduate students, recently enacted legislation encourages the *blending* of subject matter and professional preparation at the undergraduate level. In August 1997, the Commission received the SB 1422 Advisory Panel's Final Report. Following in-depth analysis of the Advisory Panel recommendations, the Commission included a provision in its omnibus legislation, SB 2042 (Alpert, Mazzoni), that encourages the expansion of blended programs. SB 2042 was signed into law on September 17, 1998.

In the past, the Commission has adopted standards for professional preparation programs and for subject matter preparation programs. In the absence of explicit standards and guidelines for the blending of subject matter and pedagogy, some colleges and universities have decided to develop blended programs under the Commission's existing standards for Experimental Programs. In September 1998, the Commission launched a new standards writing panel to develop standards for all teacher preparation programs, including permanent standards for blended programs. These standards should be available to colleges and universities by the 1999-2000 academic year.

During the Spring of 1998, Commission called together a Task Force to develop a set of *Interim Standards for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation*, to provide more clarity to colleges and universities about the Commission's expectations regarding the quality of blended programs. Adopted by the Commission in August 1998, these Interim Standards will be used by colleges and universities to guide the planning of blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation while the Commission's new Standards of Quality and Effectiveness are under development. This Handbook provides instructions to postsecondary institutions seeking to establish blended programs, and includes an Accelerated Approval option for some institutions. The Handbook also includes a Background section that describes the context in which Interim Standards for Blended Programs were developed and the specific provisions of SB 2042 regarding these programs.

What is a Blended Program of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation?

A Blended Program of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation *blends* subject matter preparation and teacher preparation by offering coursework in both areas *concurrently* and in a *connected* manner during the undergraduate years, in accordance with the Commission's Standards. Blending these two important domains of teacher preparation does not mean that a mathematics class (for example) that counts towards a prospective candidate's subject matter preparation will substitute for a math methods course, nor that a math methods course that counts toward a prospective teacher's credential requirements will substitute for a mathematics course. The Commission is deeply committed to maintaining the strength of both the content preparation and the pedagogical preparation that a prospective teacher receives. Interim Standard 3 speaks directly to this issue. *Blending* preparation in content and pedagogy will require institutions to *connect* these two domains over a four or five year period, as discussed in Interim Standard 2. Maintaining the essence of both subject matter and professional teacher preparation is a critical element of a blended program of undergraduate teacher preparation. Institutions that currently require candidates to complete a number of pre-requisites prior to entry into the teacher preparation program may include these pre-requisites in any proposal for a blended program.

Who Must Respond to the Interim Standards for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation?

Offering coursework in teacher preparation during the undergraduate sequence is not prohibited by law. Many institutions in California offer prospective teachers the opportunity to complete professional teacher preparation while they work toward completion of a baccalaureate degree. These programs will continue to exist, and institutions that sponsor them are required to submit a response to the *Interim Standards* only if they are (1) seeking funding to develop a blended program pursuant to SB 2042, or (2) seeking accreditation for a *blended* program of undergraduate teacher preparation. These two circumstances are described below. Institutions that offer undergraduate students the opportunity to complete teacher preparation courses may have some concurrent coursework, but they will not be accredited as blended programs until they meet the standards in this Handbook.

Grant Program. The Commission's 1998-99 budget includes \$350,000 to provide grants to public colleges and universities seeking to develop blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation. The Commission is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) during November 1998, inviting public colleges and universities to submit proposals for funding to support the development of programs that meet the new Interim Standards. Recipients of funding under this grant will be required to develop a response to the Interim Standards in this Handbook and submit it to the Committee on Accreditation for initial accreditation. For more information about this grant program or for a copy of the RFP, please contact Mary Vixie Sandy at (916) 445-3224 or msandy@ctc.ca.gov.

Accreditation of Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation. Any institution that intends to offer a Blended Program of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation that is accredited by the Committee on Accreditation must submit a full response to all nine of the Interim Standards published in this Handbook. Eligibility to submit a response to these Interim Standards for Blended Programs is limited to institutions that offer (1) subject matter programs that meet the *Commission's Standards of Quality and Effectiveness* and have been approved by the Commission, and (2) teacher preparation programs that have been previously approved by the Commission or accredited by the Committee on Accreditation. Institutions that intend to develop a subject matter program in response to the Commission's subject matter standards are invited to do so, and may respond simultaneously to the Interim Standards for Blended Programs. Proposals for Blended Programs must be submitted to the Committee on Accreditation for *Initial Accreditation*. Proposals will be evaluated by a Panel of trained reviewers consisting of K-12 teachers, subject matter faculty, and teacher preparation faculty from both public and private/independent colleges and universities. The Review Panel will make a recommendation regarding the initial accreditation of the program, which will be acted upon by the Committee on Accreditation. Once a Blended Program has been initially accredited by the COA, it will be eligible for continuing accreditation with the rest of the institution's professional preparation programs.

What Must be Submitted in Response to the Interim Standards for Blended Programs?

This Handbook provides specific information for institutions seeking to develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation. Institutions seeking accreditation for a Blended Program are expected to develop a full response to all nine of the Interim Standards in this Handbook. Institutions are **not** expected to include a copy of their approved subject matter program document or their accredited teacher preparation program document with their response to these nine standards. Institutions seeking to develop both a subject matter **and** a blended program simultaneously must obtain the appropriate Handbook for the subject matter program they intend to offer. Program proposals (**SIX COPIES**) should be sent to the following Commission Consultants, depending on the type of program.

Proposals for Blended Programs:

Mary Vixie Sandy, Consultant
Professional Services Division
1812 Ninth Street (**until December 1, 1998**)
1900 Capitol Avenue (**after December 1, 1998**)
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 445-3224 or msandy@ctc.ca.gov

Proposals for Subject Matter Programs:

Michael McKibbin, Consultant
Professional Services Division
1812 Ninth Street (**until December 1, 1998**)
1900 Capitol Avenue (**after December 1, 1998**)
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 445-4438 or mmckibbin@ctc.ca.gov

Accelerated Approval of Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

To expedite the accreditation of new blended programs the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation have established an accelerated approval option for these programs. Only institutions with existing approved subject matter and professional preparation programs will be considered for accelerated approval. Institutions wishing to develop new subject matter programs need to operate within the Commission's conventional policies for the approval of new subject matter programs.

Eligibility of Institutions for Accelerated Approval

A college or university that offers one or more approved subject matter program(s) and has been accredited to offer one or more Multiple or Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs is eligible for accelerated approval of a blended program that leads to the same credential. If the Committee on Accreditation (COA) has added stipulations to an institution's accreditation status, a request by the institution for accelerated approval of a blended program will be examined on a case-by-case basis. Such an institution may be ineligible to participate in the accelerated approval option. If the COA has suspended an institution's authority to propose new credential programs, the institution is ineligible for accelerated approval of a blended program.

Conditions to be Accepted by Institutions Using this Option

To use the Accelerated Approval Option, a college or university must accept the following conditions in a Letter of Intent, addressed to the Commission's Executive Director.

- The institution must agree to submit a response to the *Interim Standards for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation* within one year of submitting the Letter of Intent.
- The institution must agree that, following a review of the institution's response to the *Interim Standards* by a Review Panel, the institution will, as expeditiously as possible, make any changes in the program that are necessary to fully meet the *Standards*.
- Institutions with stipulations on their accreditation status must describe what progress has been made in addressing the stipulations and the plan and timeline for clearing the stipulations.

Attached to the Letter of Intent must be a short program plan that includes the following items:

- (1) A short description of the intended program design and rationale.
- (2) An indication of the types of credentials that will be included in the Blended Program (e.g., Multiple or Single Subject, CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis, etc.)
- (3) An indication of the subject area that will be included in the Blended Program (e.g., Liberal Studies, Child Development, Mathematics, Science, etc.)
- (4) The anticipated number of students who will enroll in the program.
- (5) A list of the program planning and leadership staff and the departments that they represent.
- (6) A program planning organizational chart that identifies which departments will be involved in developing the program and their specific areas of responsibility.
- (7) The proposed timeline for developing the program.

Procedural Operation of the Accelerated Approval Option

- Institutions seeking Accelerated Approval must submit a Letter of Intent to the Commission's Executive Director at the following address:

Dr. Sam Swofford, Executive Director
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1812 Ninth Street **(until December 1, 1998)**
1900 Capitol Avenue **(after December 1, 1998)**
Sacramento, California 95814

Commission staff will evaluate each proposal and the Executive Director will award Accelerated Approval to eligible institutions that meet the conditions described above.

- When an institution submits a program proposal in response to *the Interim Standards* in this Handbook, the proposal will be reviewed by a trained panel of reviewers according to Committee on Accreditation procedures.
- When an institution's response fulfills all applicable Standards, the Blended Program will be brought to the Committee on Accreditation for Initial Accreditation.
- If an institution fails to meet all applicable standards within the prescribed timeline, Accelerated Approval may be withdrawn.
- Subsequent to the award of Accelerated Approval, the Blended Program will be reviewed with all other credential programs during the institution's regularly scheduled continuing accreditation visits.

Interim Standards for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

Interim Standard 1: Concurrent Curriculum

In a *concurrent curriculum*, pedagogical studies at the four-year campus begin *while* an undergraduate candidate's subject matter studies are taking place. The candidate earns academic credit toward the baccalaureate degree by completing selected pedagogical courses during the undergraduate years. Beginning as early as the candidate's first year in the program, s/he completes selected education courses concurrently with related subject matter courses, or courses that blend subject matter and pedagogy.

Rationale for Interim Standard 1

Blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation should provide teacher candidates with multiple opportunities to draw powerful connections between their subject matter and professional preparation. By completing subject matter coursework simultaneously with pedagogical coursework over a four or five year period, teacher candidates can develop a deep understanding of both the content they will be responsible for teaching when they enter the classroom, and approaches to teaching that are effective and appropriate. Institutions offering blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation should make every effort to coordinate these two strands of teacher preparation effectively.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist institutions in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- To what extent does the institution offer opportunities for lower and upper division students to complete subject matter and professional preparation simultaneously?
- How effectively and consistently does the institution coordinate subject matter and education course offerings?
- To what extent are teacher candidates able to earn academic credit toward the baccalaureate degree by completing professional teacher preparation courses as undergraduates?
- What other quality indicators does the institution bring to the attention of the accreditation team related to this standard?

Interim Standard 2: Connected Curriculum

In the delivery of a connected curriculum, institutional faculty draw intellectual connections between (a) the major themes (concepts, principles, and ways of knowing) of discipline-based and inter-disciplinary studies and (b) key ideas about education, teaching, and learning. Faculty guide undergraduate candidates to think pedagogically about major themes in selected subject matter courses. In the program, candidates observe and reflect on how content is taught in selected K-12 schools. Overall, the connected curriculum is designed and implemented as a means of expanding and extending candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge and understanding.

Rationale for Interim Standard 2

Blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation offer institutions the opportunity to move away from the artificial separation between subject matter and pedagogy that has been an unintended outcome of many traditional teacher preparation programs. In order to maximize the effectiveness of this approach to teacher preparation, institutions should look for multiple ways to connect these two domains of teacher preparation. Teacher candidates who graduate from blended programs should have a strong understanding of the major conceptual and pedagogical themes and principles of their discipline.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist institutions in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- How effective are the faculty in establishing intellectual connections between the major themes of the disciplines and key ideas about education, teaching and learning?
- How extensively does the program connect multiple disciplines (i.e., for Multiple Subjects Credentials) or multiple sub-disciplines (i.e., for Single Subject Credentials) with related ideas and issues in teaching and learning?
- To what extent does the program urge undergraduate candidates to think pedagogically about major themes in subject matter courses?
- How effective is the curriculum in the blended program in reflecting both the major themes and pedagogical implications of a discipline?
- How well does the program explicitly introduce the pedagogical implications of subject matter themes as well as instructional practices based on those implications?

- To what extent are candidates given opportunities to observe and reflect on how content is taught in classroom settings and to discuss pedagogical practices in light of their understanding of subject matter themes?
- How does the design of the curriculum expand and extend each candidates' content and pedagogical knowledge and understanding in one subject area (for Single Subject candidates) or multiple subject areas (for Multiple Subject candidates)?
- What other quality indicators does the institution bring to the attention of the accreditation team related to this standard?

Interim Standard 3: Rigorous Curriculum

In the course of *connecting* subject matter and pedagogical studies, and in making them concurrent, the blended curriculum for undergraduate candidates maintains the quality, depth, scope and rigor of these two domains of teacher education.

Rationale for Interim Standard 3

Teachers need to be well grounded in both the subject areas that they will be responsible for teaching and in the pedagogical principles and skills that enable them to serve as effective educators. Blended programs should build on the strengths of both of these domains of teacher education.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist institutions in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- To what extent does the blended curriculum for undergraduate candidates maintain the prior quality and rigor of both subject matter and pedagogical studies?
- How effective is the blended curriculum in maintaining the essential depth and scope of existing subject matter and pedagogical studies?
- Does the blended program maintain a level of quality in subject matter and education studies that satisfies the Commission's Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for these programs?
- What other quality indicators does the institution bring to the attention of the accreditation team related to this standard?

Interim Standard 4: Collaboration in Curriculum Development

Faculty members from education and subject matter areas collaborate, as appropriate, to develop the content and instructional methods of the courses. The institution provides adequate time and resources to facilitate effective collaboration for developing program curriculum and courses.

Rationale for Interim Standard 4

In order for a program that blends subject matter and pedagogical studies to be effective, faculty from both domains of teacher preparation must work together. Faculty from these two areas must collaborate extensively to develop the content and instructional methods of the blended courses in order for these programs to be coherent for undergraduate teacher candidates.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist institutions in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- To what extent do the program's philosophy, design, requirements and desired outcomes reflect the consensus of affected faculty from both subject matter departments and teacher education schools?
- To what extent do faculty from subject-matter disciplines and teacher education departments collaborate in the planning and implementation of the curriculum?
- To what extent does the institution provide sufficient resources, including funding, to support effective collaboration among all faculty who contribute to the program?
- How effectively does institutional leadership encourage faculty collaboration and model cooperative professional practice?
- What other quality indicators does the institution bring to the attention of the accreditation team related to this standard?

Interim Standard 5: Developmental Quality

The blended program's coursework and field experiences are organized to reflect the developmental nature of learning-to-teach. The *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* are utilized throughout the program as a means to promote early deciders' dialogue and self-assessment regarding their preparation as prospective teachers.

Rationale for Interim Standard 5

The *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP) reflect the most current thinking and research on the nature of good teaching. A developmental view of learning-to-teach suggests the need for balance between learning the theoretical foundations of content and pedagogy and engaging in practical applications of such learning. By introducing undergraduate teacher candidates to the CSTP early in their preparation, candidates can develop skills and dispositions that will maximize their growth as they move through the stages of collegiate study, early preparation, teacher induction and ongoing development as professional educators.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist institutions in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- To what extent are the program's coursework and field experiences organized to reflect a developmental view of learning-to-teach that is articulated clearly by the institution?
- Does the program effectively balance a candidate's need for rigorous preparation in both the content s/he will be authorized to teach and effective teaching methods?
- How well does the program incorporate the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* in the curriculum of teacher preparation?
- To what extent are candidates in the program taught to use the CSTP to facilitate dialogue and self-assessment regarding their preparation as prospective teachers?
- What other quality indicators does the institution bring to the attention of the accreditation team related to this standard?

Interim Standard 6: Early Advisement

The institution and its multiple academic units provide opportunities for undergraduate students to learn about routes to teaching and to identify themselves as possible candidates. The institution and its academic units provide accurate, comprehensive information that enables early deciders to pass required credential examinations and pursue required and elective coursework leading to degrees and credentials without unnecessary delays or duplications. The four-year institution works jointly with selected community colleges in providing this information to pre-transfer students, and in identifying lower division courses that automatically earn transfer credits.

Rationale for Interim Standard 6

Prior to and during their enrollment in blended programs, undergraduate students need strong guidance and advice regarding program and credential requirements. Four year institutions should establish and maintain clear guidelines, in collaboration with community colleges, that assist and direct credential candidates as they navigate through degree and credential programs.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist institutions in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- To what extent does the institution provide opportunities for undergraduate students in many departments to learn about routes to teaching and to identify themselves as possible candidates for teaching credentials?
- To what extent does the institution and its academic units provide possible candidates with timely, accurate and comprehensive information about the credential requirements (including examinations), blended programs, and other available paths to a teaching credential?
- To what extent has the institution worked with local community colleges to develop comprehensive articulation agreements that include lower division courses to meet credential standards and requirements, and to provide accurate, timely information to lower division students (including community college students)?
- What other quality indicators does the institution bring to the attention of the accreditation team related to this standard?

Interim Standard 7: Guided Early Career Exploration

The institution offers early career exploration activities that enable undergraduate students to make valid career decisions on the basis of current, first-hand information about the qualities and characteristics of teaching careers in California's K-12 schools. With appropriate support by the institution, undergraduate candidates pursue carefully planned and guided early field experiences in selected school settings where they meet teachers, observe their work, become acquainted with school-based resources that teachers use, and discuss and reflect on their observations and experiences. Field-based activities that satisfy existing standards for subject matter programs and professional preparation programs may fully satisfy this standard.

Rationale for Interim Standard 7

Blended programs should provide opportunities for undergraduate students to explore teaching as a career prior to completing a preparation program. With well planned and guided early field experiences, institutions will be able to recruit into their programs only those candidates who have made informed decisions to become teachers.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist institutions in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- How creative is the institution in providing undergraduate students with meaningful opportunities to explore teaching as a career?
- In what ways does the institution provide undergraduate students with access to current, first-hand information about the qualities and characteristics of teaching careers in California public schools?
- How effective is the institution in planning and guiding early field experiences for undergraduate teacher candidates? Is the institution selective in choosing the school settings for field experiences?
- To what extent do the early field experiences organized by the institution enable candidates to meet teachers, observe their work and become acquainted with school-based resources?
- To what extent does the program facilitate opportunities for undergraduate candidates to discuss and reflect on their observations and experiences in public schools? Are these opportunities embedded in any courses of subject matter or professional preparation?
- What other quality indicators does the institution bring to the attention of the accreditation team related to this standard?

Interim Standard 8: Intra-Institutional Collaboration

Overall design and implementation of the program include communication, consultation and shared decision-making among the academic units that contribute to undergraduate teacher education. Specific responsibilities in the program, including program coordination and candidate advisement, are clearly assigned to specific academic units or officers at the institution. The institution provides adequate time and resources to facilitate effective program coordination, candidate advisement, faculty development, collaborative practices, and shared decision-making.

Rationale for Interim Standard 8

Effective implementation of a blended program depends on the coordination and collaboration of individuals throughout an institution. In order to ensure that blended programs strengthen and enhance teacher preparation, coordination of the program should involve faculty from all academic departments that participate in the program.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist institutions in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- To what extent does the overall design and implementation of the program include communication, consultation and shared decision-making among the academic units that contribute to undergraduate teacher education?
- How clearly and effectively are specific responsibilities in the program, including program coordination and candidate advisement, assigned to specific academic units or officers at the institution?
- To what extent does the institution provide sufficient time and fiscal and material resources to facilitate effective program coordination, candidate advisement, faculty development, collaborative practices, and shared decision-making?
- How well has intra-institutional collaboration contributed to the quality and effectiveness of the concurrent, connected curriculum of the blended program?
- What other quality indicators does the institution bring to the attention of the accreditation team related to this standard?

Interim Standard 9: Inter-Institutional Collaboration

Credential programs for undergraduate candidates include the active involvement of classroom teachers and school administrators who are responsible for the education of K-12 students. The involvement of K-12 educators encompasses multiple aspects of undergraduate teacher preparation including curriculum development and implementation, candidate recruitment and selection policies and the placement and supervision of student teachers and early field participants.

Rationale for Interim Standard 9

The effective preparation of future educators requires that multiple agencies assume joint responsibility for multiple aspects of teacher preparation. Increased levels of collaboration among institutions, agencies and organizations involved in the teacher education process are critical to the success of blended programs.

Questions to Consider

The following questions are designed to assist accreditation team members during training and continuing accreditation reviews. They may also assist institutions in preparing proposals for initial accreditation of programs and self-study reports for continuing accreditation.

- To what extent are classroom teachers and school administrators who are responsible for the education of K-12 students involved in program planning, oversight and implementation?
- To what extent are professional K-12 educators actively involved in curriculum development?
- To what extent are professional K-12 educators actively involved in the development of candidate recruitment and selection policies?
- To what extent are professional K-12 educators actively involved in the placement and supervision of student teachers and participants in early field experiences?
- What other quality indicators does the institution bring to the attention of the accreditation team related to this standard?

Background and Context for the Development of Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

Comprehensive Review of Teaching Credential Requirements (SB 1422)

In 1997 the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing completed the most comprehensive review of teaching credential policies in California history. In this review, the Commission was assisted valuably and effectively by a 24-member Advisory Panel consisting of teachers, professors, administrators, deans, school board members and parents. The Commission asked the Advisory Panel to examine all aspects of the learning-to-teach process and to recommend a comprehensive package of reforms that would improve teacher performance, effectiveness, satisfaction and retention.

Problems Addressed in the Review. The Commission's primary goals were to make the learning-to-teach process more coherent and effective for new teachers. The current system is fragmented and inarticulate because it grew by accretion and was never designed as a *system*. The review of current policy also addressed the shortages of qualified teachers in California, the need to increase access to teacher preparation for credential candidates, and the crisis in teacher attrition, particularly in hard-to-staff schools. Current policies do not sufficiently address the needs of large numbers of candidates who decide early (i.e. as undergraduates) to be teachers, nor the needs of other candidates who want to become teachers by changing careers. The Commission wanted to find ways to provide more time and opportunities for candidates to learn the complexities and subtleties of teaching without lengthening the overall time it takes to qualify for a first teaching position. Another problem has been the absence of a coherent, sequenced curriculum of teacher preparation that begins as early as the undergraduate years, includes an induction phase during the early years of teaching, and leads effectively to career-long professional renewal. Improved accountability for individual candidates as well as the programs and institutions that prepare them were also important goals of the review.

Overall Summary of Results and Recommendations. The Advisory Panel for the Comprehensive Review of Teaching Credential Requirements (SB 1422) recommended that the Commission adopt a two-tiered credential structure that (1) would align all of the requirements for earning and renewing basic credentials in a coherent system of standards-based preparation, induction and ongoing development, and (2) would provide multiple entry-points into teaching for candidates from a variety of backgrounds. Within this broad framework, the Panel also recommended that all preparation programs leading to a credential be held to standards that are set by the Commission, and consistent with the new *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP).

The two-tiered credential structure would provide for the *initial* and *advanced* preparation of teachers. Initial preparation would follow one of several proposed "routes" into teaching, and advanced preparation would enable each candidate to participate in an induction program of support, assessment and advanced study. The Panel recommended that the Commission establish greater accountability measures for credential candidates and the programs that prepare them.

The Panel also recommended that a new credentialing system require much greater collaboration between K-12 schools and postsecondary institutions in the recruitment, selection, preparation, induction and ongoing development of teachers. Collaboration was a primary theme emerging from the Panel's work. The Panel's recommendations focused on collaboration within and among the various agencies that would have responsibility for aspects of the new credentialing system.

New Standards for Improved Undergraduate Teacher Education. The Advisory Panel discussed the undergraduate preparation of teachers in relation to the needs of candidates who are most likely to participate in preparation during the undergraduate years. The Panel described this population as "early deciders": prospective teachers who decide on teaching careers substantially before earning baccalaureate degrees. The Panel also discussed other populations of prospective candidates (i.e. "late deciders" and "mid-career changers"), and developed appropriate recommendations to address the needs of these other populations.

The Advisory Panel recommended that the Commission establish new standards for the preparation and performance of each major population of teacher candidates, including the "early deciders." Rather than attempting to develop such standards itself, the Panel recommended that the Commission (1) adopt a new "architecture" for a new system of teacher recruitment, preparation, induction and ongoing professional renewal, and (2) appoint a specialized panel to write standards for the preparation and performance of all groups of teaching candidates.

Relevant Provisions of the California Education Code (SB 2042, 1998)

Following receipt of the SB 1422 Advisory Panel's findings and recommendations in the Fall of 1997, the Commission hosted a series of discussions with members of the Panel, asked many education organizations to comment on the Panel's policy recommendations, and subjected the Panel's work to careful analysis and evaluation. At the conclusion of this process, the Commission decided to sponsor reform legislation to codify and implement most of the policy reforms recommended by the Panel.

In the 1998 legislative session, the Commission sponsored Senate Bill 2042, whose authors were Senator Diedre Alpert and Assembly Member Kerry Mazzoni. With nearly unanimous votes for this bill, Governor Wilson signed it on September 17, 1998. The new statute takes effect on January 1, 1999, and includes the following provisions related to blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation.

- (1) SB 2042 establishes the following three equivalent categories of professional preparation programs for Preliminary (Level I) Teaching Credentials, including Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials and Single Subject Teaching Credentials.
 - (a) Blended programs of subject matter preparation and professional preparation.
 - (b) Postbaccalaureate programs of professional preparation.
 - (c) Internship programs of professional preparation.

In each category, all programs must be accredited by the Committee on Accreditation on the basis of *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness* that are adopted by the Commission.

- (2) SB 2042 establishes the following requirements for the accreditation of blended programs of subject matter and professional preparation.
 - (a) A blended program must enable candidates for teaching credentials to engage in professional preparation concurrent with subject matter preparation, while completing baccalaureate degrees at regionally accredited postsecondary institutions.
 - (b) A blended program must provide opportunities for candidates to complete intensive field experiences in public elementary and secondary schools early in the undergraduate sequence.
 - (c) The development and implementation of a blended program must be based on intensive collaboration among postsecondary subject matter departments, postsecondary education units, and local public elementary and secondary school districts.
 - (d) A blended program must *not* compromise the pre-existing quality and effectiveness of subject matter preparation or professional preparation at the institution, which must continue to satisfy the existing standards of the Commission.
- (3) A candidate who completes an accredited blended program of subject matter preparation and professional preparation has fulfilled one of the requirements for a Preliminary (Level I) Teaching Credential. The remaining requirements for this credential are governed by Section 44259 of the Education Code.
- (4) A candidate's Preliminary (Level I) Teaching Credential will be valid for five years from the date of issuance, and cannot be renewed. Within the five year period, the candidate must complete the following requirements of law for a Professional Clear (Level II) Teaching Credential, including a Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential.

- (a) Completion of a program of beginning teacher induction, which must be approved on the basis of *Standards of Induction Program Quality and Effectiveness*.
 - (b) Completion of preparation, in accordance with standards adopted by the Commission, that includes study of health education, study of advanced computer-based technology, and study and field experience in methods of delivering appropriate educational services to students with exceptional needs in regular education programs.
- (5) A candidate's Professional Clear (Level II) Teaching Credential will be valid for five years and must be renewed on the basis of professional service and completion of an individual program of professional growth that is aligned with the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP).

By requiring all candidates to earn a Professional Clear Teaching Credential *after* a Preliminary Teaching Credential, SB 2042 effectively extends the duration of each future teacher's preparation. By requiring certificated teachers to renew their credentials in individual programs of professional growth that are aligned with the CSTP, SB 2042 makes the California Learning-to-Teach Continuum career-long. In time, these changes in law will enable blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation to focus on the *foundations* of effective teaching, because all of the graduates of these programs will extend their preparation in induction programs and credential renewal activities.

The Commission plans to phase-in over time the credential requirements of SB 2042, which are summarized above. Candidates will not be required to meet the new credential requirements until appropriate preparation programs have been approved and established on the basis of *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness*. The following section provides information about the Commission's plan to develop new program standards.

Developing New Standards for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Preparation Programs

Maintaining high preparation standards for the teaching profession is a crucial aspect of the Commission's reform agenda. Toward that end, the Commission is sponsoring the work of a new advisory panel that will draft new standards for all Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs (including "blended programs"), based on the two-tier structure of credential requirements in SB 2042. The SB 2042 Advisory Panel has been appointed to develop appropriate standards for undergraduate and postgraduate preservice programs as well as internship and induction programs. The new advisory panel is expected to complete its work on standards during the 1999-2000 academic year, and will then recommend new standards for adoption by the Commission.

Many colleges and universities that currently offer teacher preparation programs are interested in expanding opportunities for undergraduate teacher education. In October 1997, the Commission developed a concept paper entitled *New State Policy Initiatives to Improve the Undergraduate Education of Teachers*, which described some important

qualities of blended subject matter and professional preparation programs. For colleges and universities that were reluctant to wait for the new standards, the concept paper offered an opportunity to develop blended programs using the Commission's existing *Experimental and Alternative Program Standards*. Some institutions have accepted this invitation and are in the process of developing experimental or alternative "blended program" proposals for the Commission to review.

The *Experimental and Alternative Program Standards* provide very little guidance about the design of blended programs of subject matter and professional preparation. For this reason, some institutions that move ahead in developing Experimental or Alternative programs might find, when the forthcoming standards are finished (1999-2000), that their newly-developed programs are not consistent with the new standards. At the same time, sound options for undergraduate candidates are urgently needed in California. The desire of colleges and universities to move ahead prior to the completion of new standards prompted the Commission to adopt *Interim Standards for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Education*. The Interim Standards in this Handbook will provide better guidance than the existing *Experimental and Alternative Program Standards* to colleges and universities that decide to offer a blended option to undergraduate students during 1998-99 or 1999-2000.

Interim Standards for Blended Programs

The *Interim Standards* in this Handbook are intended to serve only those institutions that already offer approved programs of subject matter preparation *and* approved or accredited programs of professional preparation for Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials. The *Interim Standards* focus on the issue of "blending," and will be in effect until the Commission adopts a comprehensive new set of standards for all teacher preparation programs. The Task Force that developed the *Interim Standards* was not asked to reconsider any of the existing standards for subject matter or professional preparation, which is the primary function of the new panel. Instead, the Task Force was asked to address the following focused issue: For those institutions whose preparation programs already meet the existing standards for subject matter and professional preparation, what aspects of quality and effectiveness are unique to (1) the blending of two existing curricula for prospective teachers; (2) the introduction of early field experience and other career explorations for undergraduate teacher candidates; and (3) collaboration among multiple groups of teacher educators? The Task Force was asked to resolve this question by drafting interim standards related to the *quality* and *effectiveness* of "concurrence" and "connectedness" in the blended curriculum, of early fieldwork and career exploration, and of collaboration in the development of blended programs.

In the coming months, members of the Task Force on Interim Standards for Blended Programs will present the *Interim Standards* to the new Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards (SB 2042). The *Interim Standards* will serve to inform the subsequent discussions of the Advisory Panel. Given the broad scope of the SB 2042 Panel's charge, it is likely that the Panel will respond positively to the results of this early work. While it is not possible to make commitments for the SB 2042 Panel, it seems unlikely that the work of the Task Force will be radically changed.

Blended Programs, Education Majors and Education Minors

The SB 1422 Advisory Panel for the Comprehensive Review of Teaching Credential Requirements discussed and debated the preparation of undergraduate students to serve as teachers. The Panel decided to address the following two significant concerns by recommending policy changes to the Commission.

- (1) Currently, the “fifth year” is widely seen as the “default option” for offering professional preparation in schools, colleges and departments of education. This arrangement often keeps undergraduate students away from their own education schools, and makes it difficult for them to obtain educational career advice or to explore education career options, in part because subject matter departments and undergraduate colleges offer relatively little information about teaching careers and relatively few opportunities for intensive experiences in K-12 schools.
- (2) By postponing professional preparation until the “fifth year” in most cases, the current system creates an artificial separation between the study and practice of pedagogy and the curriculum content that prospective teachers are expected to teach. In addition to the temporal separation of these studies over time, the two sets of courses tend to be conceptually “disconnected” from each other. Faculties are given relatively few incentives or opportunities to “connect” the study and practice of pedagogy with the curriculum subjects that form the content of each teacher’s professional practice.

To address these concerns, the Advisory Panel considered several policy options, including Education majors or minors for undergraduate students who intend to teach. After much reflection, the Panel recommended that the Commission address the dual concerns by (a) encouraging colleges and universities to offer “blended programs” of subject matter and professional preparation for undergraduate students, and (b) substantially revising the Commission’s standards for institutional accreditation. The Panel analyzed the Commission’s new process of professional accreditation under the leadership of the Committee on Accreditation. It concluded that accreditation standards for blended programs could give undergraduate students access to the studies, advisement and field experiences they need. Specifically, the Panel recommended that accreditation standards emphasize the following educational qualities in blended programs.

- (a) A concurrent curriculum in which undergraduate students have opportunities to begin the systematic study of education and pedagogy while they are completing subject matter coursework and other baccalaureate degree requirements.
- (b) A connected curriculum in which institutions emphasize important intellectual connections between the study and practice of teaching and the content studies in which prospective teachers must also be very well educated.

- (c) A collaborative decision-making process in which significant curriculum and program policies at each campus are decided cooperatively by subject matter faculties, teacher preparation faculties, and K-12 professionals in nearby schools.
- (d) Access to educational career advisement on the part of undergraduate students, including early identification of undergraduate candidates, accurate information about teaching requirements, and articulation between 2-year and 4-year institutions.
- (e) Participation by undergraduate candidates in educational career explorations, including intensive field observations and reality-based experiences in local public elementary and secondary schools.

The Panel concluded that these improvements in the preparation of undergraduate candidates could be accomplished effectively within the professional accreditation system. The specific improvements recommended by the Panel would be equivalent to the best features of Education degree programs in other states. By focusing on new accreditation standards, the Panel believed the Commission could avoid the questions of credibility that prompted California to discontinue Education degree programs in the first place. On this basis, the Advisory Panel recommended that the Commission retain the longstanding prohibition against Education majors as credential preparation options in California colleges and universities.

The Advisory Panel also examined Education minors that are offered by several colleges and universities in California. The panelists concluded that the education coursework in a blended program could, at the institution's discretion, comprise an Education minor for those undergraduate students who would like Education to be reflected on their baccalaureate degrees. Whether an Education minor is to be offered to undergraduates should be resolved by each institution, however. The Panel recommended that the Commission encourage but not require institutions to develop minors in Education.

The Commission accepted these recommendations of the Advisory Panel, and also considered questions pertaining to the length of professional teacher preparation. The Commission's sponsored legislation (SB 2042, 1998) accomplished two major changes in policies that govern the length of teacher preparation. First, SB 2042 extends the length of every future teacher's preparation by establishing new-teacher induction as a Level II Credential requirement that continues each teacher's Level I Credential preparation during the first and second years of certificated teaching service. By securing an appropriation of \$67.8 million to support the costs of induction programs throughout California, the Commission and the California Department of Education are making it possible for all new teachers to continue their preparation by participating in the highly effective Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program.

Second, for those candidates and institutions that would like to "spread" professional studies and supervised teaching over a period of two or more years, SB 2042 establishes "blended programs" of undergraduate teacher preparation and "internship programs" of postgraduate teacher preparation as *alternatives* to the year-long pre-service programs

that frequently comprise the “fifth year of study.” In these two options, professional studies are not legally confined to one year of full-time study or the equivalent.

The Commission would like teacher educators in colleges and universities to consider the severity of the teacher shortage in the schools. Blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation should be designed with this shortage in mind. The blended program option provides an opportunity to connect professional studies with subject matter learnings, not to substantially increase a credential candidate’s coursework requirements. For this reason, and given the severity of the teacher shortage, the Commission expects that a candidate should be able to complete requirements for a Level I (Preliminary) Teaching credential in five or fewer years of full-time study or the equivalent.